Pet. 21. Indeed, respondents explicitly agreed that the sole question presented here is whether the Rule applies, *see* Opp. 5, and implicitly agreed that no factual problems will interfere with this Court's ability to answer that question, *see id.* at 4.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL C. MATTHEWS
Counsel of Record
54 Stone Street
New York, New York 10004
(212) 344-1936

DAVID W. ROBERTSON
MICHAEL F. STURLEY
727 E. Dean Keeton Street
Austin, Texas 78705
(512) 232-1350

Counsel for Petitioner

August 17, 2005